

have been sold there. The only obstacles are found in the restrictive or protective laws of other nations.

To Q. 16.—The cast-iron, used about ships is manufactured in Quebec at moderate prices, but we import all the wrought-iron knees, anchors, chains, &c. from Great Britain. The iron could be imported in a rough state and finished in Quebec, but I am unable to state the cost of doing so, or whether a manufactory here would be profitable.

To Q. 17.—I could not give the information without writing to England. All our ships are not classed by Lloyd's, some being classed in the French "Bureau Veritas."

To Q. 18.—The cost of a good seven years' ship in Quebec of 500 to 1,000 tons register, complete for sea, with the ordinary Quebec outfit, would be about \$38 to \$40 per ton, say £8 sterling. In the United States such a ship would cost \$80 to \$90 per ton in *United State's currency* or say about £13 sterling. In Great Britain the cost would vary from an eight years' ship at about £10 to £11 per ton, up to a twenty years' iron ship, £15 to £16, or a fifteen years' composite. (Iron, Rock Elm, and Teak) £17 to £18 sterling per ton. These prices are low, as iron and composite ships a few years ago realized £20 to £22 sterling per ton. In France, Spain, and Italy, the cost would be a little higher for ships built of oak than in Great Britain. In all these cases, however, the outfit is more abundant than in Quebec ships.

To Q. 19.—Occasionally fault is found with the conduct of the shipbuilders' interests in Great Britain, but I do not think a protective association would cure this. The true remedy is for builders to build fewer ships *with their own means*, and thus be free to sail their ships when they cannot sell them, and save two-thirds of the commissions they now pay.

Answers of J. P. Abbey, Shipbuilder, Port Robinson.

To Q. 1.—Shipbuilder and repairer; dry docks.

To Q. 2.—Four hundred tons.

To Q. 3.—As good.

To Q. 4.—No; wages compare favorably with other mechanics.

To Q. 8.—No such ships are built here, consequently can give no opinion.

To Q. 15.—Nothing the Government can do will give such an impetus to building in Upper Canada as to get for us liberty to sell our vessels to the United States free of duty. So, can give no opinion.

To Q. 20.—In answer to this last question I would say, make trade for them; and the way to do that is, deepen the St. Lawrence canals so that a vessel can pass through drawing 12 or 15 feet of water. Then, in my opinion, vessels will load at Chicago and discharge in British ports or European ports. Of course the Welland would require to be deepened also, but that can't be so easily done in the same manner that the draft of water has been augmented from 9 feet to 10 by raising the locks, that it would necessarily follow; and when I said deepen the St. Lawrence canals, perhaps, it would have been more correct to have said raise the locks, raise the banks in the St. Lawrence Canals, but let something of that kind be done, for it is a fact, that although we have no greater capacity in our canals now than we had ten or twelve years ago, the Erie Canal, N. Y., has been nearly tripled, that is, instead of their boats carrying through their canals 3,500 bushels of wheat they now carry 9,000 through in one boat. I think also that a heavy duty should be put on all round oak logs leaving this country, otherwise, in a few years more we will not have that article to build ships with. Even now, in many places, it is hard to be got, where a few years ago it was plenty. But what is affecting our business on the Welland Canal most now is: 1st. Our vessels cannot load in Chicago and discharge in Port Colborne as formerly; and, 2nd. That if an American vessel gets any repairs done on Canada side, in any Canadian port, they have to report to their Custom House the fact and pay, as duty, 50 per cent. in gold on the amount of work done. This last affects all of us in the trade very much, as we had made large preparations and gone to great expense in erecting docks in order to do that business, and now it is cut off from us, not by the course of trade, but by an Act of Congress. If our Government can bring about any change in my two last mentioned cases, it will confer a very great favor upon all ship-building establishments on the Canadian side of the lake; and I would very strongly urge it upon their notice, if I had the position or the ability. There is another point that I ought to mention, and that is, that our marine investments are so large now on our lakes, that perhaps it would be better if the marine law of England was extended to Lake Superior instead of being cut off at Montreal.